

**STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2007-08****Middletown School District**

MICHAEL J. FRECHETTE, Superintendent  
Telephone: (860) 638-1401

Location: 311 Hunting Hill Avenue  
Middletown,  
Connecticut

Website: [www.middletownschoools.org/](http://www.middletownschoools.org/)

---

This profile was produced by the Connecticut State Department of Education in accordance with CT General Statutes 10-220(c) using data and narratives provided by the school district, testing services, or the US Census. Profiles and additional education data, including longitudinal data, are available on the internet at [www.sde.ct.gov](http://www.sde.ct.gov).

---

**COMMUNITY DATA**

County: Middlesex	Per Capita Income in 2000: \$25,720
Town Population in 2000: 43,167	Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 16.3%
1990-2000 Population Growth: 0.9%	Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 3%
Number of Public Schools: 11	District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 84.0%

\*To view the Adult Education Program Profiles online, go to [www.sde.ct.gov](http://www.sde.ct.gov) and click on Adult Education, then Reports.

---

District Reference Group (DRG): G DRG is a classification of districts whose students' families are similar in education, income, occupation, and need, and that have roughly similar enrollment. The Connecticut State Board of Education approved DRG classification for purposes of reporting data other than student performance.

---

**STUDENT ENROLLMENT**

Enrollment on October 1, 2007 5,042  
5-Year Enrollment Change -1.4%

**DISTRICT GRADE RANGE**

Grade Range PK-12

**INDICATORS OF EDUCATIONAL NEED**

Need Indicator	Number in District	Percent		
		District	DRG	State
Students Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Meals	1,642	32.6	31.0	28.7
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	140	2.8	3.1	5.4
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	295	5.9	3.3	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	548	10.9	11.8	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	366	83.0	74.1	79.2
Homeless	5	0.1	0.2	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	64	47.1	24.8	20.2

\*26.1% of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

## SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	24	0.5
Asian American	277	5.5
Black	1,283	25.4
Hispanic	628	12.5
White	2,830	56.1
Total Minority	2,212	43.9

**Percent of Minority Professional Staff:** 7.1%

**Non-English Home Language:** 5.0% of this district's students (excluding prekindergarten students) come from homes where English is not the primary language. The number of non-English home languages is 34.

---

### EFFORTS TO REDUCE RACIAL, ETHNIC, AND ECONOMIC ISOLATION

---

Below is the description submitted by this school of how it provides educational opportunities for its students to interact with students and teachers from diverse racial, ethnic, and economic backgrounds.

As in the past Middletown schools continue to offer many programs for students, staff, parents, and community members – all designed to enrich interaction and understanding among Middletown's diverse educational community. After 10 years of revising and reporting out on the district's Diversity Enhancement Plan, with its emphasis on raising expectations, maximizing parent and community involvement, and offering enrichment to support academic performance, the district chose this past year to focus intensely upon reading, and engage a greater number of parents in their children's primary grades education. The results were heartening: improved reading performance and narrower achievement gaps.

In addition to this more focused effort on reading and parent involvement, Middletown continued to offer activities and programs to reduce racial, ethnic, and economic isolation

? A range of after-school programs, including the elementary Free to Be Club to the High School's Alianza Latina continue to promote multicultural appreciation and interest. And the High School's Minority Student Coalition continues to educate students, teachers, administrators, and community members about the challenges facing students of color along with ways to meet those challenges.

? Ten schools have now become members of the state's School, Family, and Community Partners initiative

? The district's Cultural Council continues to organize and offer programs at all grades in multicultural music, dance, drama, and the arts – to all schools.

Again, with reduced Title I funding the district has become more aggressive and creative in pursuing grants and drawing upon its own resources as reflected in an additional pre-school program, expanded after-school programs, the summer academic enrichment academy to support students needing reading enrichment, and partnerships with community organizations.

---

## STUDENT PERFORMANCE

**Connecticut Mastery Test, Fourth Generation, % Meeting State Goal.** The Goal level is more demanding than the Proficient level, but not as high as the Advanced level, reported in the No Child Left Behind Report Cards.

Grade and CMT Subject Area	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Meeting Goal
Grade 3 Reading	51.5	52.0	34.4
Writing	60.2	63.4	26.4
Mathematics	53.4	60.0	19.0
Grade 4 Reading	54.7	55.9	32.9
Writing	63.7	62.9	35.8
Mathematics	52.4	60.3	23.9
Grade 5 Reading	65.4	62.2	38.9
Writing	72.3	64.5	51.9
Mathematics	65.0	65.9	34.6
Science	49.5	54.9	24.7
Grade 6 Reading	61.1	66.3	20.8
Writing	55.5	61.9	25.0
Mathematics	62.7	66.4	26.2
Grade 7 Reading	58.3	71.1	14.8
Writing	48.5	62.0	15.5
Mathematics	48.7	63.0	16.1
Grade 8 Reading	50.3	64.8	12.6
Writing	49.3	63.4	15.7
Mathematics	45.7	60.8	15.7
Science	40.4	58.6	13.8

These results reflect the performance of students with scoreable tests who were enrolled in the district at the time of testing, regardless of the length of time they were enrolled in the district. Results for fewer than 20 students are not presented.

For more detailed CMT results, go to [www.ctreports.com](http://www.ctreports.com).

To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to [www.sde.ct.gov](http://www.sde.ct.gov) and click on "No Child Left Behind."

**Connecticut Academic Performance Test, Third Generation, % Meeting State Goal.** The CAPT is administered to Grade 10 students. The Goal level is more demanding than the state Proficient level, but not as high as the Advanced level, reported in the No Child Left Behind Report Cards. The following results reflect the performance of students with scoreable tests who were enrolled in the school at the time of testing, regardless of the length of time they were enrolled in the school. Results for fewer than 20 students are not presented.

CAPT Subject Area	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Meeting Goal
Reading Across the Disciplines	31.8	45.5	21.5
Writing Across the Disciplines	53.1	57.9	27.7
Mathematics	31.4	50.1	15.4
Science	34.3	46.3	23.8

For more detailed CAPT results, go to [www.ctreports.com](http://www.ctreports.com).

To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to [www.sde.ct.gov](http://www.sde.ct.gov) and click on "No Child Left Behind."

**Physical Fitness.** The assessment includes tests for flexibility, abdominal strength and endurance, upper-body strength and aerobic endurance.

Physical Fitness: % of Students Reaching Health Standard on All Four Tests	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Reaching Standard
	29.0	36.1	23.5

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2007		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		76.6	77.6	
Average Score	Mathematics	479	504	26.2
	Critical Reading	474	502	20.8
	Writing	482	503	25.4

**SAT® I.** The lowest possible score on each SAT® I subtest is 200; the highest possible score is 800.

Graduation and Dropout Rates	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Less Desirable Rates
Graduation Rate, Class of 2007	97.3	92.6	63.1
Cumulative Four-Year Dropout Rate for Class of 2007	2.0	6.2	67.7
2006-07 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	0.4	1.7	79.3

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	82.1	83.4
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	17.9	12.3

## RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

### DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of District Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	331.40
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	15.51
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	46.40
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	113.91
Library/Media Specialists and Assistants	12.00
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	10.25
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	6.20
School Level	21.80
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	12.20
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	24.00
School Nurses	14.50
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	231.07

In the full-time equivalent (FTE) count, staff members working part-time in the school district are counted as a fraction of full-time. For example, a teacher who works half-time in the district contributes 0.50 to the district's staff count.

Teachers and Instructors	District	DRG	State
Average Years of Experience in Education	14.1	14.6	13.6
% with Master's Degree or Above	79.0	76.5	75.6

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	18.0	17.1	18.1
Grade 2	16.9	18.2	19.3
Grade 5	18.0	19.9	20.9
Grade 7	22.7	19.7	20.5
High School	20.6	20.4	18.6

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	974	983	987
Middle School	999	1,006	1,017
High School	1,002	997	1,006

\*State law requires that at least 900 hours of instruction be offered to students in grade 1-12 and full-day kindergarten, and 450 hours to half-day kindergarten students.

Students Per Academic Computer	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School*	3.7	4.3	3.4
Middle School	5.1	3.0	2.7
High School	3.5	3.0	2.7

\*Excludes schools with no grades above kindergarten.

## DISTRICT EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES, 2006-07

Expenditures may be supported by local tax revenues, state grants, federal grants, municipal in-kind services, tuition and other sources. DRG and state figures will not be comparable to the district if the school district does not teach both elementary and secondary students.

Expenditures All figures are unaudited.	Total (in 1000s)	Expenditures Per Pupil			
		District	PK-12 Districts	DRG	State
Instructional Staff and Services	\$39,341	\$7,752	\$7,153	\$7,108	\$7,159
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$910	\$179	\$262	\$235	\$266
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$1,440	\$284	\$443	\$365	\$429
Student Support Services	\$2,988	\$589	\$764	\$785	\$761
Administration and Support Services	\$5,141	\$1,013	\$1,256	\$1,216	\$1,271
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$6,851	\$1,350	\$1,329	\$1,287	\$1,322
Transportation	\$5,418	\$1,010	\$605	\$613	\$601
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$4,234	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$1,220	\$240	\$147	\$147	\$145
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$67,544</b>	<b>\$12,768</b>	<b>\$12,203</b>	<b>\$12,064</b>	<b>\$12,151</b>
<b>Additional Expenditures</b>					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$35,791	\$7,052	\$1,875	\$2,074	\$1,882

Special Education Expenditures	
Total Expenditures	\$13,968,829
Percent of Total PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education	20.7%

**Revenue Sources, % of Expenditures from Source.** Revenue sources do not include state funded Teachers' Retirement Board contributions, vocational-technical school operations, SDE budgeted costs for salaries and leadership activities and other state-funded school districts (e.g., Dept. of Children and Families and Dept. of Corrections).

District Expenditures	Local Revenue	State Revenue	Federal Revenue	Tuition & Other
Including School Construction	57.7	38.8	3.0	0.5
Excluding School Construction	69.5	25.2	4.5	0.8

---

**EQUITABLE ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES AMONG DISTRICT SCHOOLS**


---

Below is the description submitted by this district of how it allocates resources to insure equity and address needs.

The Middletown Board of Education's policy regarding distribution of resources among district schools ensures that each school receives a base level of material and financial resources. That level is determined in part by the approved school budget for the year. Funds budgeted for instruction are distributed equally among the eight elementary schools, the two middle schools and one high school, taking into account numbers of students and staff, the program and materials costs, and to some extent the needs of each school relative to student performance and socio-economic considerations. For instance, among Middletown's economically needier schools where PTA, PTO, and booster fund-raising capacity is limited, programs like the district's Cultural Council ensure that all students, irrespective of parent financial support, receive the same experiences in the fine and performing arts.

---

**SPECIAL EDUCATION**


---

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	622
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	12.1%

---

<b>Of All K-12 Students for Whom District is Financially Responsible, Number and Percentage with Disabilities</b>				
<b>Disability</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>District Percent</b>	<b>DRG Percent</b>	<b>State Percent</b>
Autism	29	0.6	0.7	0.7
Learning Disability	233	4.5	3.7	4.0
Intellectual Disability	36	0.7	0.6	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	66	1.3	1.2	1.0
Speech Impairment	131	2.6	2.6	2.4
Other Health Impairment*	84	1.6	2.2	2.1
Other Disabilities**	43	0.8	1.0	0.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>622</b>	<b>12.1</b>	<b>12.1</b>	<b>11.5</b>

\*Includes chronic health problems such as attention deficit disorders and epilepsy

\*\*Includes hearing, visual, and orthopedic impairments, deaf-blindness, multiple disabilities, traumatic brain injury, and developmental delay

<b>Graduation and Dropout Rates of Students with Disabilities for Whom District is Financially Responsible</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>State</b>
% Who Graduated in 2006-07 with a Standard Diploma	84.6	77.2
2006-07 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	3.0	2.8

## STATE ASSESSMENTS

**Percent of Students with Disabilities Meeting State Goal.** The Goal level is more demanding than the Proficient level, but not as high as the Advanced level, reported in the No Child Left Behind Report Cards. These results are for students attending district schools who participated in the standard assessment with or without accommodations for their disabilities. Results for fewer than 20 students are not presented.

- **Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT), Fourth Generation.** The CMT reading, writing and mathematics tests are administered to students in Grades 3 through 8, and the CMT science test to students in Grades 5 and 8.
- **Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT), Third Generation.** The CAPT is administered to Grade 10 students.

State Assessment		Students with Disabilities		All Students	
		District	State	District	State
CMT	Reading	12.7	20.4	56.8	62.1
	Writing	13.9	19.3	58.7	63.0
	Mathematics	11.3	22.6	54.8	62.7
	Science	7.5	22.2	45.2	56.8
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	0.0	11.4	31.8	45.5
	Writing Across the Disciplines	5.0	16.3	53.1	57.9
	Mathematics	0.0	14.7	31.4	50.1
	Science	4.8	14.4	34.3	46.3

For more detailed CMT or CAPT results, go to [www.ctreports.com](http://www.ctreports.com). To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to [www.sde.ct.gov](http://www.sde.ct.gov) and click on “No Child Left Behind.”

Participation in State Assessments of Students with Disabilities Attending District Schools		
CMT	% Without Accommodations	29.3
	% With Accommodations	70.7
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	9.1
	% With Accommodations	90.9
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		8.9

Accommodations for a student’s disability may be made to allow him or her to participate in testing. Students whose disabilities prevent them from taking the test even with accommodations are assessed by means of a list of skills aligned to the same content and grade level standards as the CMT and CAPT.

Federal law requires that students with disabilities be educated with their non-disabled peers as much as is appropriate. Placement in separate educational facilities tends to reduce the chances of students with disabilities interacting with non-disabled peers, and of receiving the same education.

K-12 Students with Disabilities Placed in Educational Settings Other Than This District’s Schools		
Placement	Count	Percent
Public Schools in Other Districts	16	2.6
Private Schools or Other Settings	94	15.1

Number and Percentage of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom District is Financially Responsible by the Percentage of Time They Spent with Their Non-Disabled Peers				
Time Spent with Non-Disabled Peers	Count of Students	Percent of Students		
		District	DRG	State
79.1 to 100 Percent of Time	478	76.8	66.9	71.6
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	50	8.0	15.0	16.6
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	94	15.1	18.1	11.8

---

**SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES**

---

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

This year's Middletown students' performance on CMTs reflects overall improvement in reading, math and writing. Grades 3-8 performance reflects a 4.75% improvement in reading, 1.5% improvement in math, and 2.6% improvement in writing. This is gratifying, given the district's emphasis on reading this past year. Although CAPT 2008 performance declined slightly overall, sub-group performance improved – as it did with CMTs, narrowing achievement gaps throughout. Despite this year's raised proficiency standards (about 10% in reading and math), Middletown's district-wide improvement of 10% resulted in its achieving safe harbor and remaining in year four of needing improvement.

The district's CALI involvement has brought about greater instructional focus and coordination. The district's three year improvement plan, incorporating Decision Making for Results, Common Formative Assessments, Effective Teaching Strategies, Making Standards Work, and Improved School Climate – will undoubtedly accelerate the academic achievement demonstrated this past year. By year's end, all professional staff will have been fully trained in Decision Making for Results, with as many as 40% having also trained in Common Formative Assessments.

---